UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,940	06/15/2001	Jerry B. Decime	10008055-1	9541

7590 01/14/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,940	DECIME ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua D Campbell	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sh t with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 10/14/2004.

2. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 16 are independent claims. Claim 7 has been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 14, and 16-19 have been amended.

3. The objection to claims 14 and 17-19 has been withdrawn due to the amended corrections made.

4. The rejection of claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 14-16, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Google has been withdrawn due to amendments.

5. The rejection of claims 2-3, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google in view of Nielsen has been withdrawn due to amendments.

6. The rejection of claims 4, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google in view of Lawrence has been withdrawn due to amendments.

7. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google has been withdrawn due to amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google (Google Friends Newsletter, May 23, 2001) in view of Nielsen (US Patent Number 5,875,443, issued on February 23, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Google discloses a method in which an unfamiliar word is identified and an alternative spelling of that word is supplied as a word variant (Page 2, "Google Spell checker almost reads your mind", and Pages 5 and 6 of Google). Google discloses that both the unfamiliar word and the word variant are run through a search engine to show the frequency of use of both words and that the results are presented to the user (Page 2, "Google Spell checker almost reads your mind", and Pages 5 and 6 of Google). Google does not disclose a method in which the unfamiliar word is identified in a document during the execution of an automatic spell-checker. However, Nielsen discloses a method in which unfamiliar words are identified in a document during the execution of a spell checker (column 3, line 17-column 4, line 47 of Nielsen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Google with the method of Nielsen because it would have made it easier to correct large, lengthy volumes of text.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Google does not disclose a method in which a word is identified as unfamiliar by determining whether or not it is stored in a database and then providing suggestions based on similarly spelled words in the database. However, Nielsen discloses a method in which a word is identified as unfamiliar by determining whether or not it is stored in a database and then suggestions are provided based upon similarly spelled words in the database (column 3, line 16-

column 4, line 47 of Nielsen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Google with the method of Nielsen because it would allowed for a working adaptable list to be kept to be used by more than one user.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Google discloses a method in which the using the search engine comprises transmitting the words to an Internet search engine via a network from a remote location (Page 2, "Google Spell checker almost reads your mind", and Pages 5 and 6 of Google).

Regarding dependent claim and 8, Google discloses a method in which an indication of the frequency of the words is expressed in terms of hits (Pages 5 and 6 of Google). Google can be used to search the open Internet or a database of categories (Pages 4 and 7-8 of Google).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Google does not disclose a method in which the frequency of results is shown as a percentage. However, Google discloses a method in which the amount of pages searched is displayed and the amount of pages that are hits is displayed (Pages 4-6 of Google). The percentage of pages that are hits is simply a function of these two values. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the methods of Google and the method of showing frequencies by percentages because it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made that percentages were used, by definition, to show the proportion of a whole that meets certain criteria.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Google discloses that the user may select and continue searching by selecting either the original or moving to the word variant once a decision is made based on the results (Page 2, "Google Spell checker almost reads your mind", and Pages 5 and 6 of Google).

Regarding independent claims 11 and dependent claims 14 and 15, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1 and 10. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1 and 10.

Regarding independent claims 16 and dependent claims 19 and 20, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1 and 10. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1 and 10.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 17, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 2. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claim 2.

10. Claims 4, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google (Google Friends Newsletter, May 23, 2001) in view of Nielsen (US Patent Number 5,875,443, issued on February 23, 1999) as applied to claims 1, 11, and 16 above, and further in view of Lawrence (US Patent Number 6,393,444, filed on March 10, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 4, neither Google nor Nielsen disclose a method in which the alternative spelling is generated by an algorithm to replace letters of an unfamiliar word with similarly sounding letters. However, Lawrence discloses a method

in which the alternative spelling is generated by an algorithm to replace letters of an unfamiliar word with similarly sounding letters (phonetically) (column 1, line 33-column 2, line 31 of Lawrence). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Google and Nielsen with methods of Lawrence because it would have provided more accurate alternative spelling results.

Regarding dependent claims 13 and 18, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 4. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claim 4.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments on pages 8-10 in reference to claims 1, 11, and 16, the examiner feels the rejection teaches all of the claimed limitations. Google teaches the generation of at least one alternative spelling of the unfamiliar word to create a word variant (see rejection above) and presents the user with the amount of hits and the number of pages searched (AKA frequency of use) on the internet and/or a specific database for both the original word and the word variant (Pages 4-8 as presented in the rejection above).

Regarding the applicant's arguments on pages 8-10 in reference to claims 8, 14, and 19, the examiner feels the rejection teaches all of the claimed limitations. Google

teaches the generation of at least one alternative spelling of the unfamiliar word to create a word variant (see rejection above) and presents the user with the amount of hits and the number of pages searched (AKA frequency of use) on the internet and/or a specific database for both the original word and the word variant (Pages 4-8 as presented in the rejection above).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
January 7, 2005

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100